

## REMARKS

The last Office Action of January 30, 2006 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 6 have been canceled. Claims 2, 7, 8, 9, and 11 have been amended. New claims 13-18 have been added. No amendment to the specification has been made. No fee is due.

Claims 1-6 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,036,265 to Weihrich.

Claims 11-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weihrich.

It is noted with appreciation that claims 7, 9 and 10 are indicated allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

For the purpose of expediting the patent application process in a manner consistent with the PRO's Patent Business Goals (PBG), 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (September 8, 2000), applicant has rewritten original claims 7 and 9 in independent form, as suggested by the Examiner, who indicated that originally filed claims 7 and 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, applicant asserts that claims 7 and 9 have not been narrowed to trigger prosecution history estoppel. *See Salazar v. Procter & Gamble Co.*, 75 USPQ2d, 1369 (stating that introducing claim 7 based on the allowable subject matter of dependent claim 3 of the "149 application was not a narrowing amendment for purposes of patentability and, therefore, does not by itself give rise to prosecution history estoppel).

Claims 2 and 11 have been amended to change their dependency. Claims 13-18 have been added and made dependant from claim 9 to set forth the subject matter of original claims 2-5, 11, and 12.

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims on file should be considered patentably differentiated over the art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the Examiner feels that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Henry M. Feiereisen  
Agent For Applicant  
Reg. No: 31,084

Date: April 4, 2006  
350 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 4714  
New York, N.Y. 10118  
(212)244-5500  
HMF/WS:af